



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
07/237,987	10/29/88	MONCADA	32281

DONALD BROWN
DIKE, BRONSTEIN, ROBERTS,
CUSHMAN AND PFUND
130 WATER STREET
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER	
DENTZEB	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
121	4

DATE MAILED:

12/16/88

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- ☒ Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
- ☐ Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948.
- ☐ Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449
- ☐ Notice of informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152
- ☐ Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474
- ☐ _____

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

- ☒ Claims 35-38 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.
- ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
- ☒ Claims 35-38 are rejected.
- ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.
- ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
- ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes until such time as allowable subject matter is indicated.
- ☐ Allowable subject matter having been indicated, formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
- ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. These drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation).
- ☐ The ☐ proposed drawing correction and/or the ☐ proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner. ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved. ☐ disapproved (see explanation). However, the Patent and Trademark Office no longer makes drawing changes. It is now applicant's responsibility to ensure that the drawings are corrected. Corrections MUST be effected in accordance with the instructions set forth on the attached letter "INFORMATION ON HOW TO EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES", PTO-1474.
- ☒ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received
☒ been filed in parent application, serial no. 795524; filed on 5-10-77
- ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
- ☐ Other

Serial No. 237987

-2-

Art Unit 121

Claims 35 to 38 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the prior invention as set forth in claim 7 of U.S. patent no. 4,539,333. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are both drawn to a method for treating hypertension using prostacyclin.

The obviousness-type double patenting rejection is a judicially established doctrine based upon public policy and is primarily intended to prevent prolongation of the patent term by prohibiting claims in a second patent not patentably distinct from claims in a first patent. In re Vogel, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970). A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(b) would overcome an actual or provisional rejection on this ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.78(d).

Claims 35 to 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs, as the claimed invention is not described in such full, clear, concise and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to make and use the same, and/or for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. "Prostacyclin anion" finds no antecedent basis in the specification. It should be replaced by "prostacyclin and its pharmacologically acceptable salts" See page 5 of the specification

Serial No. 232987

-3

Art Unit 121

Claims 35 and 37 are duplicates.

The U.S. Patents assigned to Upjohn cited by
applicants are made of record.

D

DENTZ:wdh

A/C 703 557-3920

12/12/88

mlee

MARY C. LEE
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 121